KHRUSHCHEV OPENLY UNFURLED THE BANNER OF SPLIT AND BETRAYAL

(In relation to the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963)

THE "NAIM FRASHERI"
STATE PUBLISHING ENTERPRISE
TIRANA

KHRUSHCHEV OPENLY UNFURLED THE BANNER OF SPLIT AND BETRAYAL

(In relation to the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963)

Article published in the newspaper
Zëri i Popullit

October 4, 1963

THE "NAIM FRASHERI"
STATE PUBLISHING ENTERPRISE
TIRANA 1964

As it has been announced in the press, an open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union addressed to the organizations of the Party and all the communists of the Soviet Union was published in the newspaper *Pravda* on July 14, in response to the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. This letter was published in full in yesterday's issue of our newspaper, too.

The entire propaganda machine of the present Soviet leaders and of those who follow in their tracks was mobilized to give this letter widespread publicity. It was hailed as a "new programmatic document for the entire international communist movement", and a "new brilliant pattern of creative Marxism", which allegedly constitutes "a valuable contribution in defense of the basic theses of Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declarations" against the assaults of the so-called "dogmatists" and so on and so forth. A practice of this kind has become a habit with the modern revisionists when it

comes to written materials published by Khrushchev's group, be it a speech, an article, a letter or a resolution. But the very fact that a "new communist manifesto" appears every two months shows clearly the real value of these documents.

The Belgrade clique of renegades gave a very enthusiastic reception to the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Yugoslav press is filled with lots of material strongly supporting Khrushchev's schismatic policy, pointing to the identity of views between the Tito clique and the Khrushchev group, extolling Khrushchev's "determination" to reject the views of the Communist Party of China and not to make any concessions, and urging him to carry his struggle against the Communist Party of China and the other Marxist-Leninist parties to the end. The Tito clique are fully justified in hailing this open letter, because in it they once again clearly see that the Khrushchev group are speeding post-haste along the same path of betrayal they themselves have already taken before and to which they have long tried to draw Khrushchev and his entire group.

The imperialists and all the reactionaries are also full of enthusiasm for the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Western press has dedicated whole columns of comments to this letter. This letter has been favorably commented upon by persons of authority as well. But why, may we ask, has this letter been received so favorably by the imperialists and reactionaries? The Western press makes no secret of these reasons at all. The American newspaper *New York Herald Tribune,* in its July 15, 1963 issue, wrote quite openly that "the West is vitally interested in the internal affairs of the communist empire". The Western press and statesmen have called the open letter "a very interesting document" which "shook the very foundations of the unity of the communist world", which strengthens "the possibility of the Soviet Union to come into closer contact with the West", etc. The open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was hailed with great joy by the imperialists and reactionaries because they see in it not only a frontal attack against Marxism-Leninism and against all the socialist countries and the

communist parties who stand on sound revolutionary grounds, but a new, convincing proof that Khrushchev is speeding ahead towards rapprochement and reconciliation with them.

The fact that the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union alone has become a source of nutriment for the anti-Chinese campaign on the part of the imperialists and reactionaries, that it has met with the approval of and has been hailed by the enemies of socialism and Marxism-Leninism, by the imperialists, the reactionaries and the Belgrade traitors, would probably suffice to show that it is nothing less than an anti-Marxist and anti-socialist document, a manifesto of betrayal, which must be condemned and rejected by all Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary communists.

A FRONTAL ASSAULT AGAINST THE GENERAL LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

As regards both its content as well as the time chosen for its publication, this letter indicates that it occupies a definite place in

the activity of Khrushchev's group and serves as a signal in mainly two respects.

On the one hand, the open letter gave the signal for a new general crusade of the joint revisionist forces against the revolutionary line of the international communist movement defined in both the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations, against all the fraternal revolutionary communist parties which abide by them faithfully, particularly against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, against the unity of the socialist camp and all the international communist movement.

On the other hand, the open letter served to prepare the ground for and to call attention to the new steps which the modern revisionists are taking to get into closer contact and more open collaboration with the imperialists.

Immediately following the publication of the open letter, Khrushchev's group and their followers in other countries launched a widespread campaign of slanders against the Communist Party of China. Articles have been written and are being written galore, verbal and written statements have been issued, resolutions have been adopted in the

name of the central committees of the communist parties and workers' parties in Czechoslovakia, France, India and elsewhere for this purpose. The same history is being repeated as in the case of the Party of Labour of Albania after the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where immediately following the public assaults by Khrushchev's group, the entire revisionist chorus rose to their feet and, following the conductor's baton, condemned "the Albanian heretics" and supported Khrushchev in his discordant acts against the unity of the socialist camp and the entire international communist movement.

It is really to be regretted but it is a fact that today, when the modern revisionists, from Tito to Khrushchev, have launched a general assault against Marxism-Leninism, trampling under foot the vital interests of peoples and of socialism, the leaders of certain parties are unconditionally succumbing to the dictates of a group of traitors and are following them in this great plot which has been set up and carried out to the detriment of the working class and of the peoples of the world. It is to be wondered whether they have seriously thought of

the steps they are taking, of the responsibility they are taking upon themselves, when they join in the anti-Chinese, anti-Albanian, anti-Marxist and anti-socialist campaign of the revisionists and the imperialists. Has it ever occurred to them that they will have to answer one day for all their position and acts?

The open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a general attack on the Communist Party of China and the other fraternal parties which defend Marxism-Leninism, it is a general attack on the revolutionary line of the international communist and workers' movement, on the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. It is a collection of slanders and monstrous trumped-up charges made purposely to discredit the Communist Party of China and to aggravate the divergencies within the ranks of the international communist movement. It departs altogether from serious discussions of principle on these divergencies, makes no analysis of and gives no reasons for matters on which these divergencies have arisen, resorts to disgusting banalities and vulgari-

ties and distorts in a monstrous way the correct Marxist-Leninist views and position of the Communist Party of China. It is full of foul invectives against and basest insults to the Communist Party of China and its leaders and the chauvinist spirit of the big state permeates it from top to bottom.

On the other hand, the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union vividly reflects the anti-Marxist methods which Khrushchev's group resorts to in their unprincipled attempts to force their line of betrayal on the entire international communist movement and to make short work of their opponents — the Marxist-Leninist parties. It slanders when it attributes to these parties the most shocking and absurd things borrowed from the most reactionary imperialist propaganda sources and from Tito's renegade clique, on the basis of which Khrushchev's group build all their "arguments". Taking advantage of the feelings of peace-loving people, it launches all kinds of reproaches against the Marxist-Leninist parties in order to discredit them before the communists and peoples, to isolate them, and thus to liquidate every obstacle in the path of betrayal along which

Khrushchev's group intend to proceed unhampered and even to draw along with them the entire world communist movement. Khrushchev and his group stand in need of these attacks against the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and the other fraternal parties that stand on solid revolutionary grounds in order to spread their revisionist and capitulating views in connection with the major issues of the general line of the international communist movement among the ranks of the communist movement more easily.

But the attempts of the revisionists will come to naught and will meet with total failure. The very fact that their principal method in polemics is based on slanders and trumped-up charges does by no means prove that Khrushchev's group stand on sure grounds, but on the contrary that they are weak and afraid of the truth of Marxism-Leninism.

Since the open letter of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union deals with matters of general interest to the international communist movement, even launching direct attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania, our Party deems it necessary to have its say

about this letter without intending to give a detailed answer to it, particularly because it has already expressed its stand clearly, in much material published in the press, on many matters which are brought up in the recent letter of Khrushchev's group.

I

The whole core of divergencies between Khrushchev's group and the Communist Party of China, which in fact is a difference of principle between modern revisionism and revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, is reduced in the letter in a very vulgar and slanderous manner to the issue in which it is pretended that the Communist Party of China is in favor of a new world war and opposed to peaceful coexistence, whereas the Soviet leaders are in favor of peace and peaceful coexistence. The propaganda machine of the Soviet leaders and of those who follow him is raising a deafening noise to present Khrushchev as "a great champion of peace", etc.

But the indisputable facts of present-day life prove the contrary: they show that the

Communist Party of China as well as all the Marxist parties, which Khrushchev and his group brand as warmongers, are the real fighters for the maintenance and effective strengthening of peace, whereas Khrushchev and his group, in spite of their loud clamour for peace and peaceful coexistence, are by their views and deeds seriously prejudicing the cause of peace and are facilitating the work of the imperialist aggressors in the preparation and launching of wars.

ACCORDING TO KHRUSHCHEV IMPERIALISM IS NO LONGER A SOURCE OF AGGRESSIVE WARS

By proclaiming far and wide that the nature of war has allegedly changed at the present time because of the existence of powerful nuclear weapons of destruction "which admit of no class principle", Khrushchev's group and their followers have in fact discarded as outdated and worthless the Leninist theses on war as the continuation of policy by other means, and on imperialism as the source of wars and aggression.

Is this not borne out very clearly by the repeated illusions which Khrushchev himself and his entire propaganda machine have been spreading and continue to spread about the governments of Kennedy and Macmillan and about the governments of the other imperialist powers, claiming that they are "peaceful", "prudent" and "realistic" and that only certain "lunatics" in imperialist countries are in favor of war? Attempts are made in the open letter to disguise this erroneous stand by posing the question: do the "dogmatists" seriously think that all bourgeois governments are entirely unreasonable in all their deeds? Yes, the bourgeois governments reason, but their "reasoning" is determined by the interests of that system and those social forces which they serve. If the problems of war and peace were determined by the independent "reasoning" of the bourgeois governments then we would have to admit, for example, that the cause of the outbreak of the First World War did not lie in the contradictions of the imperialist powers, which had their source in the very nature of the capitalist order, but in the venturesome acts of certain "lunatics" as the Kaiser, Clemenceau or Poincaré. Or

we would have to admit that the cause of the outbreak of the Second World War by Hitlerite Germany lay in the "imprudent" and "non-realistic" reasoning of such a "lunatic" as Hitler and not in the plundering interests of the German military imperialists. The line of Khrushchev's group, as it always happens with revisionists, is contradictory: on the one hand, they claim in words that they abide faithfully by the stipulations of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations according to which the main force of aggression and of war is *American imperialism*; on the other, they cry at the top of their lungs that in imperialist countries there are only a few *"lunatics"* who are in favor of war, *that Kennedy and his government "show great concern for the maintenance of peace"*, etc. Are we to mean by this that Kennedy and his government are not the representatives of American imperialism, of the main stronghold of aggression and war, that only a few "lunatics" who are opposed to Kennedy's "peace-loving" government, are its representatives? If that were so, would it not lead to the absurd conclusion that American imperialism holds no sway over its own land!?

But it is a known fact that politics is a concentrated expression of the economy, that the policy pursued by the government of this or the other imperialist country is determined in the last resort by the economic interests of the big monopolist bourgeoisie which is in power in this or that country, that there exist no governments independent of the interests of the classes in power. Khrushchev's group have openly departed from these familiar Leninist principles, from class analysis of the phenomena of the modern social life, spreading openly the idealist and subjective view that Kennedy's government allegedly follows a policy altogether "independent" of the big monopolies that have brought him to power. Of course, under the present ratio of forces in the world, thanks to the joint struggle of the socialist camp, of the international working class, of the peoples who fight for freedom and national independence and of all the peace forces, it is possible to compel the imperialists to fall back, to prevent the imperialist warmongers from setting the world ablaze, to forestall a new world war and to put an end to the aggressive wars launched by the imperialists. But this does by no means

mean that the aggressive nature of the imperialists has changed, that the imperialist powers and their governments have given up their aggressive policy, their policy of preparing for and launching different wars, that they have been converted from warmongers into peace-lovers. This is no reason whatsoever for spreading dangerous pacifist illusions about the chiefs of American imperialism and for lulling the vigilance of peoples, as Khrushchev's group and all the revisionists do.

Their statements that Kennedy and the government of the USA is pursuing a "peaceful" and "wise" policy, which has allegedly created favorable conditions for easing international tension and for solving international issues by peaceful means, are based on the fact that the government of the United States of America has agreed to carry on various talks and to "collaborate" in certain directions with the Soviet leaders. It is true that connections and very hearty relations have recently been established between Kennedy's imperialist government and Khrushchev's group, but on what matters and to whose benefit has this collaboration been? It has been to the advantage of

the imperialists and to the disadvantage of socialism, of peoples and of peace in the world. Is this not borne out in their collaboration and the joint actions they have taken to prevent the People's Republic of China from strengthening its defensive power, to impose "an international inspection" by the United States of America in Cuba with regard to the withdrawal of Soviet missiles, to suppress the national-liberation movement as in the Congo, etc.? On the other hand, are these connections and relations sufficient reason to proclaim Kennedy and his government as "peace-loving"? Are we to take it that it is not the American imperialism headed by Eisenhower and later by Kennedy, that has undertaken and continues to undertake so many aggressive acts against socialist Cuba, that has intervened and continues to intervene in Korea and South Vietnam, in Laos and in the Congo, that pursues a frenzied armaments race, that revives, rearms and encourages the revengeful militarists in Western Germany and in Japan, that consolidates the military aggressive blocks and the military bases around the socialist countries? Is it not the imperialist governments which intervene everywhere in

order to suppress the national-liberation struggles of oppressed peoples with fire and sword? These are facts which everyone in the world knows. But apparently Khrushchev's group do not consider these acts of the American imperialists as aggressive; apparently the sufferings and bloodshed of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are of little concern to Khrushchev's group. According to the revisionists, wars and aggression are only those that may take place next door to them, therefore, so long as Kennedy is establishing friendly and cordial relations with Khrushchev and his group, he is "peaceful"! A queer idea but quite understandable, for the revisionists have abandoned proletarian internationalism and have drifted to narrow bourgeois nationalism.

But it becomes more clear every day that by spreading such illusions about the American imperialists and their chiefs, Khrushchev's group are causing serious damage to the cause of peace. By lulling the vigilance of people, by drawing their attention away from the necessity of fighting with might and main the imperialist policy of war and aggression in order to checkmate

the imperialist warmongers, thereby giving the latter a free hand to keep up their armaments race and to prepare for and launch various aggressive wars, Khrushchev and his group are seriously increasing the danger of war. By departing from the Marxist principle of class analysis, Khrushchev's group try to attribute warlike intentions to certain socialist countries, especially the People's Republic of China, against which it launches base and monstrous attacks, which serve no other end but to draw the attention of people away from the dangerous acts of the imperialists, away from the preparations for war.

A "NEW" THEORY: THE DANGER OF WAR COMES FROM THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES (! ?)

The Communist Party of China as well as the other fraternal parties which firmly uphold the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and oppose Khrushchev's revisionist line of action, are reproached for being allegedly in favor of spreading socialism through a nuclear war which would destroy hundreds of millions of people, for being

presumably in favor of the armaments race and opposed to peaceful coexistence between countries of different social systems and so on. "The Chinese comrades openly ignore and belittle the whole danger of nuclear warfare," the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has it. "Certain Chinese leaders holding positions of responsibility have expressed themselves likewise in favor of the possibility of sacrificing hundreds of millions in war," it adds, and continues: "We would like to ask the Chinese comrades who propose to build the beautiful future on the ruins of the old world, on the dead of the nuclear war: did they consult, on this issue, the working class of countries where imperialism is in power?"

It is not the first time that Khrushchev's group make a charge of this kind against Marxist-Leninist parties. It is well known that in his infamous speech to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on December 12, 1962 Khrushchev made the sensational "discovery" that in addition to the "lunatics" in the ranks of the imperialists who are in favor of war, there are also, he claims, the so-called "dogmatists" who "do not believe that

socialism can triumph under conditions of peaceful coexistence"! In fact he accused the Party of Labour of Albania for having allegedly tried to make the Soviet Union and the USA fight each other!

But it must be said that Khrushchev is by no means the originator of such ridiculous charges against Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist countries. It is known that the imperialists have always accused the communists that by launching calls for revolution they intend to set the world ablaze. They have always made an accusation of this kind against the Russian Bolsheviks, particularly following the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The imperialists have always made use and continue to make wide use of this charge in order to justify their unbridled armaments race and their hostile acts against the socialist countries and the socialist camp as a whole. Thus, Khrushchev has appropriated an old accusation of the imperialists and used it against the Communist Party of China, against the Party of Labour of Albania and against all the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists.

We also recall that this accusation against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania has likewise been launched before by the Yugoslav revisionists who tried to argue and seemingly prove theoretically that even a socialist country may perpetrate aggressive wars and endanger peace in the world. By repeating these same accusations against the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and all the revolutionary Marxists, Khrushchev shows that his political and theoretic lines are identical with those of the Titoite clique of traitors, that he is fully at one with them in their fight against the correct line which the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and all the other Marxist parties so firmly uphold.

Khrushchev and his supporters have trumped up this charge against the communist parties and socialist countries which are allegedly in favor of a nuclear war as a means to assure the triumph of socialism in the world, to please his followers and to mislead the simple-minded. The real views of the Communist Party of China, of the Party of Labour of Albania and of all the

Marxist-Leninist parties in connection with their stand towards war and revolution, towards atomic weapons and nuclear warfare are publicly known. They are known by the very authors of these trumped-up charges. The Party of Labour of Albania, the Communist Party of China and every other Marxist-Leninist party have always strictly observed and still observe the thesis that socialism cannot be exported through wars between states, that its triumph in each country depends firstly and mainly on the determined struggle of the working masses guided by the working class and its Marxist revolutionary party. The Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China, like every communist and workers' party, are opposed to world war. They are opposed to destructive nuclear war as well as to any other aggressive war which the imperialists and various other reactionaries prepare and launch; they firmly and consistently strive for peace and peaceful coexistence, and are fully convinced that the joint efforts of the socialist camp, of the international working class, of the powerful anti-imperialist national-liberation movement and of all peace-loving peoples throughout the world can and

will stay the hand of the aggressive imperialists. But at the same time they expose and denounce the capitulating policy of the modern revisionists, the policy of succumbing to atomic blackmail of the American imperialists, which arouses panic among the people, discourages and makes them cower before the imperialists armed to the teeth. They call upon the peoples to strive to stay the hand of the aggressive imperialists and to prevent them from plunging the world into nuclear war. But at the same time they warn that if the imperialists precipitate a new war, the peoples will give the imperialists their final deathblow and will bury for all time this abominable system which causes the world so much suffering and sacrifice.

It is queer but, according to Khrushchev's logic and that of his supporters, it turns out that if one stresses the thesis put forth by Lenin and reiterated in both Moscow Declarations, that imperialism is the source of wars and aggression, that "so long as imperialism exists, the basis of aggressive wars exists also", as the Communist Party of China, the Party of Labour of Albania and other Marxist-Leninist parties do, that

amounts to denying the possibility of preventing a world war at the present and even to favoring the outbreak of war! In other words, according to Khrushchev, if one is not to be a warmonger, not to aggravate and poison the international atmosphere, one should abstain from exposing and denouncing the aggressive and warmongering policy of the imperialists, first and foremost of the American imperialists. Khrushchev's group have not only abstained from denouncing the imperialists but try to force this policy on all communist and workers' parties, threatening them that if they fail to obey they will be branded as "warmongers". This is really and truly a great service Khrushchev is rendering to the American and other imperialists for which he has well deserved their gratitude and praises.

According to Khrushchev's logic it also turns out that if one stresses the 1960 Moscow Declaration's thesis on the inevitability of the triumph of socialism throughout the world and the downfall of imperialism, and states that if the imperialists launch a world war it would spell their complete defeat, this is equated to mean being in favor of a nuclear war for the purpose of exporting so-

cialism on the ruins and the corpses of mankind! What then are the revisionists headed by Khrushchev after? Do they want the communist and workers' parties to no longer speak of their aims, give up their ideals, persuade the people that in case of a war of this kind humanity would be wiped out of existence, that the triumph of socialism in all countries at the present time when atomic weapons exist, is in doubt?

A BASE CALUMNY MADE FROM POSITIONS OF RACE DISCRIMINATION AND CHAUVINISM

Khrushchev has recently made another new "discovery". The open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union says that the views of the Communist Party of China can be explained by the fact that they are "either completely divorced from reality and approach the problems of war, peace and revolution in a dogmatic, bookish way, failing to understand the concrete conditions of our era, or behind their clamour about 'world revolution' are other aims, aims that have nothing in com-

mon with revolution", and in an earlier part of the letter says: ". . . this is no longer a class approach to the struggle for the abolition of capitalism, but there are entirely different aims. If both the exploiters and the exploited are buried under the ruins of the old world, who will build the 'beautiful future'?"

Just what are these "different aims" which the Chinese comrades seem to nurture are very clearly stated in the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. According to Khrushchev's group, the Chinese seem to intend to establish their domination over the world, the domination of the yellow race (!). In their letter of July 14 Khrushchev's group accuse the Communist Party of China of racial trends. Following this cue the Soviet press launched a wide campaign to "prove" this. The *Pravda* also published an interview with a certain Gafurov, an "orientalist scholar", but who for the sake of politics has betrayed science, who went so far as to assert that the Chinese "substitute chauvinist-nationalist and even racial concepts for the historical science of Marxism . . ., that they idealize the past, extol the feudal meth-

ods of politics — conquests, wars between principalities, bloody incursions, they praise the role of Genghis Khan". This is the "strongest" "argument" of Khrushchev's struggle of "principle". It is evident that when one runs out of serious arguments, one is bound to refer to such other means as have been drawn from the waste basket of history, from the arsenal of slanders against communism by the imperialist bourgeoisie.

A reproach of this kind against a Marxist-Leninist party and against a socialist country is by no means casual on the lips of Khrushchev's group who are plunged deep into the mire of big-state chauvinism. Facts go to show that it is none other than Khrushchev's group that have confounded class conceptions with nationalist and racial ones. The brutal and unparalleled economic, political and military pressure accompanied by outright intervention in the internal affairs of other parties and countries like those against Albania, China and other countries, for the purpose of forcing their line on them, show who it is in reality that tries to establish the domination of czars over the socialist camp and the international communist movement. To what other thing do the dithy-

rambs which Khrushchev sang to slavism during his sojourn to Yugoslavia point, if not to a policy from positions of racial trends? The shift of Khrushchev's group to such abominable positions is quite conceivable, it is a logical consequence of their departure from Marxism-Leninism.

But even in this matter Khrushchev and his group cannot claim originality. It is known that the Communist Party of China has long been accused of racial trends by the imperialists and the most frenzied racial addicts, who for a long time have been speaking of the "yellow peril" which it is claimed is menacing the world. We have heard this said by the Yugoslav revisionists long before we heard it from Khrushchev. Renegade Tito formulated this accusation against the Communist Party of China very clearly at the 7th Congress of the Yugoslav People's Youth on January 23 of the current year. He said then that the Chinese "reckon that they have 700 million citizens in their country and they have arrived at the conclusion, according to them, that whatever may happen, 300 million Chinese will survive in an atomic war and in the other countries very few will be left"; and he added: "A

policy of this kind of the Chinese leaders is not a Marxist but a Genghis Khanian policy with which no sober-minded people will agree." And here now, Khrushchev's group speak against the Chinese comrades in the same terms as the imperialists and reactionaries do, in the same terms as Tito, the renegade, does. The Chinese policy, the American *New York Herald Tribune* wrote on July 18, 1963, is "so barbarous and frightful as to make up a plot against mankind on such a wide scale as the world has never seen so far". This Chinese plot, according to this newspaper, "consists in hurling the United States and the Soviet Union into a nuclear war which would destroy a good part of the white race and would leave eastern communists as 'masters of the earth'."

Speaking of the "communist peril" the imperialists have always used this slogan as a mask to fight the socialist countries. It is a known fact that in the past, in order to fight the Soviet Union and the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution, they raised the problem of the "Slav peril", organized the *cordon sanitaire* against it,

and a whole theory based on war against the "Slav peril" was invented by the German Nazis as a pretext in preparing for the Second World War. There is no doubt that the imperialists by raising a hue and cry about the "yellow peril" are guided by the same intentions that Hitler was guided by at his time, but by providing Khrushchev's group with the "yellow peril" slogan the American imperialists try at the same time to draw them into a joint plot against the People's Republic of China. This is openly spoken of nowadays. It is by no means accidental that the Western press has recently devoted much of its writing to clearly expressing the idea that faced with the Chinese peril the Soviet Union and the United States of America may strike up a joint alliance to confront this "peril". Thus, for instance, the American newspaper *New York Herald Tribune* wrote on July 18: "The idea is often expressed that if a divorce comes between the Soviet Union and communist China, Moscow will finally ask for a marriage or some other kind of agreement with the West." The newspaper continues: "The time may come sooner than expected

when it will be to the interest of both the Soviet Union and the United States to stand together against a warlike communist China."

The intentions of the imperialists are thus very clear and need no comment. But what are the intentions of Khrushchev and his group, who have appropriated this slogan of the bourgeois imperialists and speak of the "yellow peril", reproaching the Chinese comrades with "racial" and "Genghis Khanian tendencies", etc.? Are they preparing in earnest to enter into this "sacred alliance" with the imperialists against China? Or do they intend to coax the American imperialists, the Indian reactionaries and others for fresh and more daring acts of aggression against China? Or do they intend to take more determined steps in this direction themselves? Time will show. It is a fact, however, that they have lined up with the imperialists on a very unworthy and dangerous cause. But both the imperialists and the revisionists make calculations without those concerned. Their plots will fail just as those of their forerunners have failed.

KHRUSHCHEV'S GROUP SERIOUSLY ENDANGER THE CAUSE OF PEACE BY THEIR ACTS AND VIEWS

Many other practical acts of Khrushchev's revisionist group in the international arena speak of the great damage they have been doing to the cause of peace and socialism.

Let us recall the events of the Caribbean crisis to which Khrushchev's group refer again in more detail in the open letter of July 14. In spite of the deafening propaganda of the Soviet leaders pretending that it is thanks to their attitude and to that of Khrushchev personally that Cuba was rescued from aggression and the world from a nuclear war, it is clear to every unbiased man that Khrushchev's initially adventurous and later capitulating acts have seriously prejudiced the cause of peace, Cuba and the Soviet Union itself, that the Caribbean events aggravated the international situation to the utmost, placed socialist Cuba in a critical situation, discredited the Soviet Union, encouraged the American imperialists in their policy from positions of strength and atomic blackmail, opened the way for such "reasonable compromises" with the im-

perialists which are in fact unconditional capitulations to them.

Let us also take the recent agreement on the partial ban of nuclear tests between the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Britain about which the modern revisionists are making a lot of noise by presenting it as a brilliant success of the policy of peaceful coexistence and as an important step towards complete and general disarmament and towards assuring peace in the world. In reality this agreement is a shameful bargain of Khrushchev's group with the imperialists, just as Khrushchev himself called it on September 9, 1961. It is the first serious contract, disadvantageous to socialism and profitable to the imperialists, which Khrushchev signed with the USA and England and which can only be followed by other worse ones. It aims at lulling the vigilance of peoples, at deceiving them under the pretense that a big step has been made towards disarmament and peace; on the other hand, it proclaims as warmongers all those who oppose this agreement which enables the American imperialists to continue their nuclear tests underground, to improve and increase atomic weapons, to maintain the

monopoly of atomic weapons in the hands of certain powers so they can use them as a means of pressure and blackmail against others. An agreement of this kind weakens the defensive power of the socialist countries, is directed against the People's Republic of China, gives superiority to the imperialists and seriously prejudices the cause of world peace.

Are we to consider the attitude of Khrushchev's group towards the Sino-Indian border conflict as "a major contribution to the cause of peace"? The question is that Khrushchev's group did not only take the side of the Indian reactionaries led by Nehru, against a socialist and a peace-loving country — the People's Republic of China, but they collaborate with the American, British and other imperialists in supplying Nehru with modern weapons (rockets, fighter and transport aircraft, etc.) which are used for aggressive purposes against China. This is an open incitement to the Indian reactionaries for them to carry on aggressive acts against the People's Republic of China, a thing which aggravates the international situation and endangers peace in Asia. What is more, Khrushchev's group are trying

to set the neutral countries of Asia against China by very base means. All this cannot be considered otherwise but as an open betrayal of the cause of socialism and peace.

Such are the facts.

It is, therefore, high time for all to firmly expose the entire demagogy of the modern revisionists for peace, to tear off the mask they have put on themselves as "torch-bearers of peace". The line they proclaim so loudly as "the line of peace" is in reality the line that leads to war. The way to safeguard and consolidate peace is by no means that of submission and capitulation, that of pleading and flattering the imperialists, that of spreading all kinds of illusions about imperialism and its chiefs, that of unprincipled concessions and compromises, that of alienating the peoples from revolutions and national-liberation wars, that of splitting the socialist camp and the international communist movement, that of weakening the defensive power of the socialist countries and of coaxing the imperialists and the reactionaries against them, as the revisionists are doing.

The way towards preserving and consolidating peace passes through the determined

struggle of all the united revolutionary socialist, national-liberation and peace-loving forces against the imperialists, against the latter's policy of aggression and war, in order to force peace and peaceful coexistence on them. It must be said very clearly that pleadings, concessions and capitulation to the imperialists have never made the imperialists more sober, have never made them give up their predatory intentions to oppress the peoples of the world and establish their rule over them. Such a policy of submission and unconditional surrender which the modern revisionists preach and which Khrushchev and his followers are putting into practice, has the contrary effect: it tickles the palate of the imperialists, it makes them more arrogant, more aggressive. As a matter of fact, with their opportunist line, Khrushchev's group of traitors are encouraging the imperialists to embark on military ventures and facilitate their work in re-establishing their rule over the world.

II

In their July 14 open letter Khrushchev's group try in a demagogical way to persuade

the communists and peoples that they are in favor of revolution, in favor of their emancipation from capitalist and colonial yoke, that they strive to find the best and surest way to make socialism triumph in conformity with the conditions of the present epoch, that they allegedly carry on a dogged struggle for the triumph of socialism, of national independence, of democracy and peace in the world.

But such a demagogy will deceive neither the communists nor the people. From their own experience, they are being more and more convinced that Khrushchev's group have embarked on the path of betrayal of the cause of revolution and they are trying by all their views and acts to estrange the people from the struggle against capitalism and imperialism, to curb their energy and to plunge them into a state of inertness, by sowing fear and panic about the horrors of nuclear warfare.

DENYING REVOLUTION UNDER THE PRETEXT OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

It is an undeniable fact that Khrushchev's revisionist group have been turned into a

zealous propagandist of the atomic blackmail of the imperialists. They loudly proclaim that war would be "suicide" for mankind, that it would bring about "the extermination of mankind and the collapse of modern civilization", that a war would "annihilate our Noah's Ark", that is, our terrestrial globe. It is not without purpose that the July 14 open letter speaks in the blackest terms about the great destructive power of the atomic bombs and of the great number of such bombs accumulated to this day, nor is it not without purpose that it said "a new nuclear war would cost the lives of hundreds of millions of people in the very first hours of its outbreak", and that it would "sweep out of existence whole states", that a new war would "destroy the heritage of human civilization", that "the atomic bomb admits of no class principle", that it "exterminates without distinction both the capitalist and the worker, all those who come within the range of its destructive action", etc.

Why does all this unbridled propaganda of the modern revisionists speak of the horrors of war and its disastrous consequences? It clearly shows that the revisionists are scared to death, that they have plunged into the

mire of defeatism and pessimism, that they have lost all reliance on the future of humanity, on the triumph of socialism and communism, that they have lost everything that characterizes every revolutionary — the hatred towards the imperialists, the resolution and courage to fight, the confidence in victory — that they have given up revolution.

But why do the revisionists make such a big noise about this? Can there be anybody in the world today, however limited his cultural standard may be, who does not know what the present atomic weapons represent and what a new world war with the use of these weapons would be like? Khrushchev's calumny that the Party of Labour of Albania, the Communist Party of China and the other Marxist-Leninist parties do not understand the peril of nuclear weapons and their consequences, is only designed to deceive people. In the arguments of Khrushchev's group in connection with this matter there is a flagrant contradiction which goes to prove that all attempts to slander and discredit the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Albania and the other fraternal countries have led them away from the

plainest of logic: on the one hand, they say that a nuclear war would sweep away our "Noah's Ark", that is, all mankind would be wiped out of existence, whereas on the other, they say that "in case the imperialist lunatics would, nevertheless, launch a war, people would sweep away and bury capitalism". But if you admit the second thesis as true, then why do you accuse as warmongering the Marxist-Leninist parties which uphold this thesis to the letter? And if you admit as true also the thesis that a war would wipe away the whole of mankind, who would then survive to "bury capitalism"?

Khrushchev's group stand in need of atomic blackmail in order to make their revisionist and capitulating line in connection with the major issues of present world development and of the international liberation and revolutionary movement more acceptable. By this they tell the communists and the people: Either adopt my line of action or otherwise your doom will be sealed in the heat of a nuclear war. The open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union points out clearly what this line is. It is the line of action which departs from the struggle of carrying out the

historic mission of the proletariat, the line of giving up the struggle for the emancipation of the working class and of all the labourers, the line that renounces the fight against imperialism for the victory and triumph of socialism, of national independence and of democracy. The revisionists have proclaimed the maintenance of peace at all costs as their final goal. For the sake of it, according to them, we must sacrifice everything, the revolution and the struggle against imperialism included. They have set up a whole theory to confirm that the struggle for peace today is everything, it is the key to the solution of every problem, to the entrance into every door, and to which all the revolutionary tasks of the working class and of the peoples of the world should be made subordinate. All their other anti-Marxist views and all their practical anti-socialist and opportunist trends have their source in this.

Peace under all conditions and at all costs, peace with all and above all, peace on earth and in heaven — this is the credo of every modern revisionist. But this is nothing else except total shameful capitulation to the imperialists and their threats, complete renun-

ciation of all revolutionary principles and ideals, an unconditional surrender and kowtow to the imperialist enemy, a downright shift to the line of the reformists and capitulators, to the bourgeois liberals and pacifists.

And whoever opposes this line of betrayal of Khrushchev's group is dubbed as a "dogmatist", a "sectarian", an "adventurer", a "pseudo-revolutionary", is accused of being in favor of war, in favor of achieving the triumph of socialism on the corpses of people and on ruins, is accused of advancing a "left opportunist platform on the basic issues of our times", etc. But what is the real meaning of these monstrous slanders and accusations?

To call on people to revolt and to safeguard the achievements of the revolution, to call on people to take up arms against imperialism for their national emancipation, to support and come to the help of the revolutionary national-liberation struggle of the peoples, to expose the imperialists, their aggressive and warmongering policy in defense of peace, this, according to Khrushchev, means "to be in favor of war", "to be in favor of building socialism on the ruins

and corpses of people", "to be venturesome and warmongering". To meet war with war, aggression with self-defense, oppression and exploitation with revolution, colonial enslavement with struggle for freedom, ignominy with the struggle for human dignity, interference in internal affairs with the fight for national sovereignty, this, according to Khrushchev, means "to be opposed to peace and peaceful coexistence", to lead the world "into nuclear disaster" with "irreparable consequences". In short, Khrushchev openly demands to give up revolution, under the pretext of safeguarding peace. But this means to betray revolution.

Communists have always struggled to avert imperialist aggressive wars and to safeguard peace, but they have never given up their ideals and have never demanded peace under all conditions and at all costs, they have never submitted and kowtowed to the class enemy. The objective of the fight of the communists is not peace at all costs, but the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the world on a socialist basis through the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

If the modern revisionists consider the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence as the only form of struggle against the imperialists which would lead to the final destruction of imperialism itself and the victory of socialism on a world scale, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists reject these illusions. The modern revisionists set the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence against the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social emancipation and consider almost all the achievements of this struggle of peoples against imperialism, colonialism and capitalism as a result of the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, but this is a fallacy pure and simple. It is true that the struggle for peace and the struggle for independence, democracy and socialism are closely bound together and inseparable from each other. The struggle for peace is to the interests of all peoples and does by no means exclude the other struggles of peoples against capitalism, oppression and exploitation of the imperialists, just as the struggle for socialism, national independence and democracy is most effective in safeguarding and consolidating peace, since it is precisely this struggle that undermines and shatters

the positions of imperialism, that restricts their sphere of domination, that makes it ever more difficult for them to carry out their warmongering and aggressive plans.

NOT ECONOMIC COMPETITION NOR PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE BUT THE STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE OF EVERY COUNTRY IS THE DECISIVE FACTOR FOR THE VICTORY OF THE REVOLUTION

While the revisionists of Khrushchev's group demand on the one hand that revolution be given up under the pretext of the danger of a nuclear war, on the other hand they spread the erroneous view that peoples need not resort to revolution, because their liberation and socialism will come of itself as a consequence of the successes of the socialist countries in economic competition with the capitalist countries, of the realization of peaceful coexistence and full and general disarmament.

It is plain to every Marxist-Leninist — and nobody can deny it — that the world socialist system plays a decisive role in the development of the revolutionary processes going on in the world today, it is the main

stronghold, the powerful bedrock and support of the world revolutionary movement. The achievements of the socialist countries in building socialism and communism, the example they set, play a major revolutionary role among the labourers of the capitalist countries. But the role and influence of the world socialist system cannot be confined to economic competition and peaceful coexistence alone, as the modern revisionists are doing. The latter do not neglect accidentally the tasks of socialist countries to expose imperialism, its reactionary ideology and its warmongering and aggressive policy, to give unreserved support to the fight of peoples against capitalism and imperialism, to consolidate the friendship, collaboration and mutual assistance among socialist countries, and to raise the power, the role and the prestige of the socialist camp.

Khrushchev's accusation that we belittle the role of the world socialist system in developing the international revolutionary and liberation movement, is groundless. In order that the socialist system may play its great and decisive role in the world, it is necessary that it should be united, that it should raise its economic power, that it should strengthen

its defensive capacity and pursue a correct internal and foreign policy. But do Khrushchev's line, attitude and acts serve this purpose? It is precisely he who, by attacking the socialist countries and their communist parties, which abide by Marxism-Leninism, and by embarking on shameful negotiations with the imperialists and the Titoite clique, is undermining the unity of the socialist camp. Who else but Khrushchev has ruptured diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania, has reduced them to the minimum with the People's Republic of China, is restricting them day in day out with certain other socialist countries, causing a serious damage to the struggle for strengthening the positions of socialism? Is it not Khrushchev who is doing his utmost to weaken the defensive strength of the socialist camp and has concluded a holy alliance with the American imperialists, with the Indian reactionaries and the Belgrade renegades against the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Albania, against socialism?

The Party of Labour of Albania, like all other Marxist-Leninist parties, considers the world socialist system as the greatest triumph

of the working class and of all the workers of the world and as a decisive factor in the development of human society. But it has been and continues to be of the opinion that the victory of revolution, of socialism, cannot come of itself as a consequence of the successes, of the role and of the influence of the socialist system of the world, and less so as a consequence of economic competition and of the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries alone.

The world socialist system, its strengthening and development, only create favorable conditions for the revolutionary and liberation struggle of the peoples, *favorable possibilities* for waging and winning this war. It plays a primary role especially in safeguarding the freedom and national independence of the peoples who have been emancipated, in protecting the achievements of the revolution from the peril of exportation of counter-revolution by the imperialists. But a decisive factor for the success of socialism and the liberation of peoples is the revolution, is their determined fight against capitalist oppression and exploitation, against the colonialists and the imperialists. It is precisely this struggle that turns into

reality the favorable possibilities which the existence and role of the world socialist system creates.

Therefore, to emphasize in a biased way the importance and the role of the world socialist system, and, more so, to lay stress on the importance of the policy of peaceful coexistence and of economic competition between the two systems, considering them as a "magic wand" to solve "all the vital problems facing society" while, on the other hand, to belittle the power of the people, the decisive role of their fight for their liberation from the yoke of capitalism and imperialism, and more so, to fail to give it all the necessary support and aid, without reserve and hesitation, as the modern revisionists are in fact doing — this means to cause great damage to the cause of world revolution, to weaken the revolutionary spirit and the liberation war of peoples, to lower their confidence in their self-reliance. to plunge peoples into a state of inertness awaiting liberation as a boon from abroad. It is thus clear that it is precisely the modern revisionists who lack confidence in the triumph of socialism and communism, lack confidence in the forces of peoples, in their

fight for liberation, in the revolution, and have shifted over to the anti-Marxist line of denying the revolution.

THE EVIL LIES IN KHRUSHCHEV'S REVISIONIST COURSE

In their July 14 letter Khrushchev's group, taking under their protection, approving and justifying the reformist and opportunist line of their followers in the leadership of certain communist and workers' parties in the capitalist countries, attempt to justify the departure of these parties from the path of revolution under the pretext that the necessary objective conditions for a revolution in their countries are not ripe, etc. Khrushchev enlarged on this matter in his speech to the Supreme Soviet in December last year, uttering a series of slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania that it allegedly abides by "the theory of heroes" and thinks that "revolutions can be brought about artificially" at one's will and pleasure, at any time and in any country.

Every thoroughly trained communist is well acquainted with the teachings of Marx-

ism-Leninism on the objective conditions, on the revolutionary situation, on the role of the masses, classes, parties and leaders in carrying out the revolution successfully. If the objective conditions are lacking, if the revolutionary situation is not ripe and since these cannot be created artificially but by the social, economic and political development of the country itself, by its internal and external contradictions, then there is no question of revolution. But it is also well known that revolutions do not just happen of their own, as a consequence of the objective factors alone. Revolutions are the result of the activity of the classes and masses guided by the party, therefore, they can be successfully carried out and carried to victory only when the subjective factor is at its height of efficiency, when a strong and well-organized party exists which follows a correct Marxist-Leninist line of action, capable of training the masses in a revolutionary spirit, of organizing, mobilizing and leading them towards the revolution.

The problem of revolution is the internal problem of the people of each country. But it is a fact that in some countries conditions had been ripe for the cause of revolution to

make headway and they have not been utilized, just as there are today countries of that kind, yet the revolution is far from them. In some former colonial and dependent countries the communist parties have let the chance slip away from them, did not take the leadership of the national and national-liberation movement (they did not even join with them right at the start, awaiting "peaceful liberation"), or failed to act with the necessary vigor and are now being ruthlessly persecuted by the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie of those countries. The main responsibility that the subjective factor, the party of proletariat, has not been and is not equal to its revolutionary duty in certain countries, falls entirely on Khrushchev's group. This is a direct consequence of the revisionist line, which, in certain countries, has led to really tragic events for the communists and the masses.

We are quoting here part of a letter of an Irakian comrade written in a dark prison cell of the reactionaries who rule there, a heart-rending appeal to find out the author of the tragedy of the Irakian Communist Party:

Dear Friend,

Yesterday we were indescribably massacred. Now we have the horror of waiting for slow and futile deaths. I do not at all want to speak of tortures, it is in vain to do so. I only request that you and we, together, find out the one who bears the "historical responsibility" for this disaster. While we are meeting with horrible death in silence, all the "international" comrades sit snugly in their villas, with the feet in their slippers, preparing other speeches.

Ah! dear friend, can you tell me how "our Comrade Khrushchev" will come out of this, for our escape from here seems impossible to me. Will you dare to join me in laying the blame on him? For we have striven for years to prove to our people the falsity and danger of a movement guided by another class different from ours, and here now comes Mr. Khrushchev who is doing his utmost to make our efforts end in smoke and to enable the Arab reactionaries hold sway for a long time, for too long a time.

When tomorrow you receive this desperate call, my ailing heart will have stopped throbbing. My last thoughts will have been that you take care of your friends, for what is happening here is very, very critical.

Just one final question: can you understand with what zeal "Comrade Khrushchev" is standing by Tito, who was the first to give recognition to "our" present fascist regime? Can you understand hearing Michel Aflak, chief of the Baas, pay homage to Tito?

I cannot say much more. My struggle with despair will soon end with a speedy death. As you know a man's life here is of little worth. It suffices for one to be dubbed a communist.

Tell them, friend, whom we are to thank, that all the revolutionary impetus of the masses, all the growing power of the Arab peoples and all the opportunities offered by the contradictions of the enemy forces, were let to slip by in a very foul way in favor of the most ruthless fascist elements who are now using them against our peoples. . . .

I beg of you, with tears in my eyes, to lay this matter before others, whoever they may be, whatever their tendencies . . . and if I cannot have an answer, that's all right, since you will know it.

A. K. B.

Such are the real consequences of the revisionist line of betrayal of Khrushchev and his group. This is the price in blood that the line of reconciliation and closer contact with imperialism and reaction is exacting.

Khrushchev's group and those who follow in their wake, try to hush up this undeniable truth by all methods and means, and try to lay all the blame on others or on the lack of objective conditions, of the revolutionary situation. But this manoeuvre, too, shows them in an even worse light. To make absolute the role of the objective conditions of the revolution and to deny or bypass in silence the role of the subjective conditions, as Khrushchev's group are doing in their July 14 open letter too, is nothing else but an excuse to give up the idea of the revolution and to concentrate all attention and efforts on the struggle for reforms within the bounds of the capitalist order of things

under the pretext that objective conditions for revolution are lacking. This means to trust the cause of the revolution to spontaneity and to postpone it *ad calendas graecas.* This is an anti-revolutionary attitude. The task of every revolutionary is not to wait and see, to let things take their course and abstain from doing anything. It is up to him to lay the ground for a revolution and to lead the masses in revolution. But the revisionists have renounced this task, they have betrayed the cause of revolution, they have turned to reformists and social-democrats.

AGAINST SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC REFORMIST ILLUSIONS

The revisionists have rested all their hopes on reforms within the bounds of bourgeois legality and constitutions. They try to persuade by all methods and means the communists and masses that transition to socialism is possible through reforms and evolutionary methods. No one ignores the significance of the struggle for democratic reforms in economy and politics, least of all under the

present conditions when the imperialist bourgeoisie have flung away the banner of democracy and there is no one else to raise this banner aloft again except the working class and their communist party. But to stress only one side of the matter, the link between the struggle for democracy and struggle for socialism, and to make no distinction between them, to identify the struggle for democracy within the framework of the bourgeois order of things, with the struggle for socialism, and to confine the struggle for socialism to the struggle for certain bourgeois democratic prerogatives, thus moving the masses and parties away from the ultimate goal of their struggle, as the modern revisionists do, this has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism — this is reformism pure and simple.

The reformists have plunged into the mire of bourgeois prejudices about democracy, they deny the class nature of democracy, they speak of democracy in a haphazard way, they raise a clamour and proclaim at the top of their voice that transition to socialism can be achieved within the bounds of bourgeois democracy, by extending these bounds, without breaking up the old state apparatus

and without establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the help of the capitalist state itself which, according to them, stands or may stand above classes. Under such circumstances the struggle for democracy is inseparable from the fight against the dangerous opportunist and reformist illusions of bourgeois democracy and of the struggle for democracy which the revisionists of Marxism spread, which in turn move the working class and the masses away from socialist revolution.

Shifting completely to social democratic reformism, the modern revisionists raise a clamour about the peaceful path of transition to socialism. They claim that the possibilities for this path today are great and keep growing from day to day, they make it the absolute and almost the only real and effective way to cross over to socialism. For demagogical purposes Khrushchev feels obliged to pose as being in favor of both ways, of the peaceful and the non-peaceful way. But was it not Khrushchev who, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, advanced the peaceful path as nearly the only possible way to cross over to socialism under the present circum-

stances? Was it not Khrushchev's group who omitted any mention of the non-peaceful path in their draft of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and who, in their draft of the 1960 Moscow Declaration, spoke of the growing possibilities of the peaceful ways? If Khrushchev is in favor of both paths to achieve transition to socialism, why does he then not only abstain from referring to them but sides openly with those like Togliatti and Co., who have pointed to the peaceful path as their general line of action and who say nothing about preparing at the same time for both the peaceful and the non-peaceful paths, about preparing for both eventualities and mastering all the forms of revolutionary combat.

Khrushchev's calumny that the Party of Labour of Albania favors only an armed uprising at all times and in all countries is a grotesque manoeuvre in order to cover up his departure from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the paths to achieve transition to socialism, in order to propagate the peaceful path as the almost only way possible. The Party of Labour of Albania has more than once made clear its stand on this matter. It abides by Lenin's teachings that

"in order to fulfil its obligations, the working class must master *all the forms* and *sides* of social activity, without the slightest exception . . . that the revolutionary class must be prepared to substitute one form for another quickly and at once" (*Works*, vol. 28, page 96, Albanian edition). We are not opposed to the peaceful method as a rare opportunity of achieving transition to socialism, but we are opposed to making the peaceful path absolute and we are opposed to its reformist and opportunist interpretations as a plain parliamentary way, as an outcome of the majority of votes cast in a parliament. We are first and foremost in favor of the non-peaceful path, because under present conditions this is the surest and most effective way for the triumph of socialism.

Discussions of the paths of transition to socialism are not simply discussions of doctrine, but discussions of great practical significance for the development of the world revolutionary movement. To stress the peaceful path, to concentrate on this way alone, means to sow pacifist and reformist illusions, to estrange peoples from the real way of combating capitalist oppression and

exploitation, means in fact to perpetuate capitalism and to renounce revolution. History has recorded no case in which the ruling classes of exploiters have turned their power over of their own free will; on the contrary, they have used all methods and means, not excluding the method of open coercion, to suppress every revolutionary movement and to maintain the power in their hands. Is it to be understood that the present imperialist bourgeoisie is an exception of some kind and is prepared to move away from the historic arena of its own free will? Let the modern revisionists cite but one single example, if they can.

KHRUSHCHEV'S GROUP UNDERMINE AND SABOTAGE THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF PEOPLES

Under present conditions, one of the most important criteria by which to judge whether a party, leader or communist stands on revolutionary grounds or not, is to find out what attitude it, he or she maintains towards the national-liberation and revolutionary movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where the absolute ma-

jority of the population of the world dwell, which have become the weakest links in the imperialist chain, the crucial points of contradictions of the capitalist world and which have turned into hotbeds of the anti-imperialist, liberation and revolutionary struggle of peoples. The struggle that is being waged in these regions is a struggle of world historical significance both for the destiny of the peoples of these continents themselves, for their emancipation and their future, as well as for the progressive development of the entire human society, of the workers' movement and of the fight for socialism in other countries.

But what is the attitude of Khrushchev's group towards this hard but heroic war which the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are waging?

The assurances appearing in the July 14 open letter pretending that Khrushchev's group are the most earnest and determined supporters of the anti-imperialist national-liberation fight of enslaved peoples sound altogether false and demagogical. On the contrary, it is well known that under the pretext that "every spark might set the world ablaze", Khrushchev's group have striven

and strive to hold the people in leash and check their armed uprising. It is a well-known fact by all that the representatives of Khrushchev's group at the various international democratic organizations and at the latters' conventions have firmly upheld the thesis that the main duty of the peoples newly liberated or still under bondage is not to fight for their national liberation and to defend their freedom and national independence from the imperialists, nor to consolidate them, but to strive to achieve full and general disarmament which will allegedly bring them freedom and security automatically and without "unnecessary sacrifices". According to Khrushchev, such countries as Cuba, Algeria, the United Arab Republic, Indonesia and others, should not raise their defensive power in order to meet the threats and aggression on the part of the imperialists, the old and new colonialists, but they should strive to achieve disarmament under the pretext that in case of danger there is someone there to protect them (just as that someone protected Cuba when he sent rockets there and withdrew them shamefully under pressure of the American imperialists!). It is no secret that the Soviet

representatives have done their utmost at various international conventions to block the passage of resolutions firmly condemning American imperialism and have spread all kinds of illusions about the imperialists, pretending that they too can help in the uplift of the economy and national culture of the colonial and ex-colonial peoples with the resources set free from disarmament, etc. Similar attempts were also made by the Soviet delegates at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia and Africa recently held at Nicosia, Cyprus. What interests Khrushchev's group more than anything else is to alienate the peoples from their determined struggle against the imperialists, to make the revolutionary national-liberation movement serve their basic purpose: peace under all conditions, at all costs, with the imperialists.

Through an attitude of this kind towards the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Khrushchev's group cause great damage not only to the vital interest of these peoples, to their liberation and revolutionary struggle, but also to the vital interests of the working class and the

workers of the capitalist and socialist countries, to the interests of their struggle for the triumph of socialism and communism. Khrushchev's accusation that the Party of Labour of Albania, the Communist Party of China and the other fraternal parties deny the role and significance of the struggle of the working class and labouring masses of the advanced capitalist countries of Europe and America, is a complete calumny. Doubtless this struggle is of great historical significance, for, while the national-liberation movement deals the enemy a blow at his outposts, the communist and workers' movement in the highly developed countries deal him a blow in the face, right in his own quarter. But the point is that the revolutionary and liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is the most powerful and greatest ally of the working class in the capitalist countries, of the peoples of the socialist countries, and of the world proletarian revolution. Without its support the proletarian and popular masses of the capitalist countries of Europe and America would not be able to realize their aspirations. "The revolutionary movement in advanced countries," Lenin has said, "would be practically

misleading without full cooperation and closest contact between the workers fighting capitalism in Europe and America and the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of slaves in the 'colonies' oppressed by this capitalism" (*Works*, vol. 31, page 301, Albanian edition). Hence the major revolutionary task of the international communist and workers' movement to give full and unreserved support and assistance to the struggle of the oppressed workers and nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America under Lenin's slogan "Proletarians of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!"

It is precisely this internationalist duty that Khrushchev's group and their followers have gone back on and are stressing in an altogether one-sided way the national-liberation movement's task to join and collaborate with the socialist countries and the workers' movement in the capitalist countries; they preach that it is in this that the role of leadership of the working class is expressed guaranteeing the transition of these countries into socialism. But we all know that the national-liberation movement in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin

America, in the majority of cases, is not led by the working class and its revolutionary party but by the anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie. Hence it turns out according to the revisionists that transition to socialism can be achieved under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie in alliance with the socialist countries and the workers' movement in the capitalist countries. This is not merely a logical conclusion of the contents of the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but it is a general viewpoint of the revisionists. According to them India, for instance, at the head of which stand the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie, has already embarked on the road to socialism and is building it successfully. None other than Dange, Chairman of the Communist Party of India, who is openly under the protection of Khrushchev's group, wrote Nehru a letter of birthday greetings on November 14, 1962, couched in such terms: "You laid the foundations of New India, which is pursuing the policy of socialism", wishing him many happy returns of the day, "in order to realize your ideal — the building of a flourishing socialism in

India" and promised him the support and help of his clique of traitors. But if "socialism" could be built also under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie, and more so, by its reactionary wing, then what need would there be for Dange's "communist" party? Or is its function just to be a servant of the various bourgeois and reactionary circles and to support and help them realize their ends, which has nothing in common with scientific socialism? Apparently it is precisely this disgraceful role that the revisionists have assigned to the vanguard of the working class, the communist party.

It is clear to every communist who has attentively followed the views and acts of Khrushchev's group and has not been deceived by their demagogy, that this group have betrayed the cause of the revolution, the cause of the emancipation of the working class and of the people, and are trying to hinder, check and bungle their work through their views and acts. It is high time to tear off the revolutionary mask of Khrushchev's group and to expose their true anti-revolutionary features. Today, this is a duty of prime historical importance.

III

It is very significant that a good deal of space is devoted in the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the distortion and falsification of the historical truth about the origin and the development of the differences within the ranks of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement. A desperate effort however, to no avail, is made here to throw the blame on others. But the world is already aware of the truth of this matter. Our Party too has said its word in connection with this matter.

IT IS KHRUSHCHEV'S GROUP THAT SOW DISSENSION

The split did not begin in April 1960 (with the publication of *Long Live Leninism!*, as the open letter has it), but much earlier. Khrushchev's group sowed the seed of dissension as early as the beginning of their activity following the death of J. V. Stalin, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party

of the Soviet Union in 1956. Their campaign against Stalin, a great revolutionary and distinguished Marxist-Leninist, launched at this Congress under the guise of the so-called "struggle against the cult of the individual" was in fact a blow to the basis of Marxism-Leninism, to the general line of action of the international communist movement, to the dictatorship of the proletariat and to socialism, which Stalin had firmly upheld throughout his living days. Khrushchev made use of this fight to prepare the ground for spreading his revisionist line and for forcing it upon all the parties, upon the entire international communist and workers' movement. The cult of the individual served him as a scarecrow to threaten and liquidate all those who opposed his opportunist line, to intervene most brutally in the internal affairs of the other parties and to change by force their leadership. In the secret report and other materials of the 20th Congress some of the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism were revised, the historical experience of international significance of the October Revolution was ignored and a sensational creative discovery of achieving

transition to socialism through peaceful parliamentary ways was trumpeted abroad.

Immediately following the 20th Congress and gradually consolidating their position, Khrushchev's group continued to plunge, at times camouflaged and at other times openly, deeper and deeper into dissension, by undertaking more and more dangerous acts which seriously handicapped the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist and workers' movement. It started to spread all sorts of illusions about imperialism and its leaders, to sing praises to and to present them as guardian angels of peace, to preach that imperialism has now changed its nature, that "a world free of arms, free of armies, free of wars" can be established promptly, to present peaceful coexistence as the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries and as a "magic wand" to solve all vital issues that face mankind, to give up exposing imperialism and to speak of only a few "lunatics" and "crazy individuals" as being the source of the danger of war, etc. All these showed openly the general tendency to get close to and cooperate with the class enemy, imperialism, and particularly with American imperialism,

the main stronghold of aggression and war in the world.

At the same time and in a roundabout way imposed by time and circumstances, Khrushchev's group embarked on their line of rehabilitating Tito's clique, of reconciliating and collaborating with them, tearing to shreds the Resolution of the Informbureau which condemned the Yugoslav leaders as revisionists, traitors and agents of imperialism. In collaboration with the Belgrade renegades, Khrushchev decided on who should be the leader of this or that party, thus intervening together with Tito's clique in the internal affairs of other parties.

In September 1959, in a statement published by the TASS news agency, Khrushchev's group sided openly with the Indian reactionaries in the Sino-Indian border conflict, and accused a socialist country, the People's Republic of China, of having started this conflict, of being an aggressor. In his speeches Khrushchev has more than once assailed the leaders of the Communist Party of China and of the People's Republic of China, thus laying the divergencies open before the enemies.

It is Khrushchev's group who organized the backstage plot at Bucharest in June 1960, to condemn the Communist Party of China, to liquidate this obstacle lying in their way of spreading the revisionist line. It is Khrushchev himself who called the 1960 Moscow Declaration "a document of compromise that would not last long", and who, before the ink of his signature to this document dried up, began to revise it, to move further and further away from the joint line of the international communist and workers' movement. It is precisely Khrushchev's friends and followers, P. Togliatti and Co. who, right after the 1960 Moscow meeting, laid bare to the enemy the polemics that took place at this meeting and launched open attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania.

Khrushchev's divisive activity reached a new height at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union through the repeated attacks on J. V. Stalin, through the adoption of the new revisionist, opportunist and pacifist program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, through the frenzied campaign of slanders against the Party of Labour of Albania and its leaders.

Following the 22nd Congress, Khrushchev's group embarked on the unparalleled procedure of extending ideological differences to the field of state relations with the People's Republic of Albania and with the People's Republic of China, of taking more and more dangerous steps towards coming into closer contact with the enemies of socialism and peace — the American imperialists, Tito's clique, the Indian reactionaries and the Vatican. There is no end to the list of deeds which Khrushchev's group have undertaken to sow dissension. But many of these facts are widely known and everyone can judge for himself as to who in reality started and kept up the work of splitting the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist and workers' movement.

How nauseous is the demagogy of the open letter where its authors shed crocodile tears about their "concern" over the situation they themselves created and the steps they pretend to have taken to "avoid a split"! They try to attribute to themselves the initiative for talks, but everybody knows that this initiative was taken by certain other fraternal parties as early as 1962. Khrushchev and Co.'s conduct has been to throw the stone

and hide the hand, to stab one in the back and smile to his face. Let us recall, among other instances, what Khrushchev did at the 6th Congress of the German United Socialist Party, where, after *having launched humorous attacks and slanders* on fraternal parties, he proposed a *cessation* of polemics. It is he and none other that takes for himself the right to forward suggestions and draft platforms for the communist movement (as he did in his March 30, 1963 letter), whereas when others introduce counter-proposals, they are reproached with being "anti-Marxist", etc. (as he did in regard to the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China). When has Khrushchev ever made even the slightest self-criticism for his flagrant anti-Marxist and hostile acts against the socialist countries and fraternal parties? When has he ever made proposals for bilateral talks "to settle differences and adjust relations" without inserting in them imperative clauses prejudicing the parity and independence of this or that fraternal party or fraternal country?

In his open letter Khrushchev looks for auxiliary material in the activity and at the

meetings of the international organizations of the masses in order to cover up his divisive acts and to slander those who firmly uphold Marxism-Leninism. But this is equally futile. How much laughter will the distortions of truth cause among the honest representatives of these organizations who have been eyewitnesses to the attempts of Khrushchev's representatives at the various meetings to revise the correct line of their organizations, a matter which has met with the justified opposition of other Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries! As to the figures of "majority" in these meetings and organizations, which the open letter makes much of, it is very well known that it has not always been such (for instance, at the Moshi Conference, at that of the journalists in Djakarta, etc.), whereas in other cases it has been purely relative, as it has been and continues to be in the communist and workers' movement.

Now, after all this, let us revert to certain questions posed previously, but which Khrushchev's group have never answered and cannot answer: why was there no rift in the socialist camp and in the international communist movement prior to the past ten

years (before embarking on their "new course")? Why was there unity and solidarity in all international, progressive, democratic and peace-loving organizations up to that time? Why is it different today? There is but one answer to these questions: from the time when Khrushchev's group came to power in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and onwards they became the cause of dissension and intrigue in the communist and workers' movement and in the entire revolutionary, democratic, anti-imperialist and peace front.

Just as before, so also in the open letter, Khrushchev's group, trying to justify one of their most deplorable acts that led to the split in the communist movement, take Tito's renegade clique under their protection — proclaim Yugoslavia a socialist country and the League of Yugoslav Communists a "fraternal Marxist party" and try to impose the line of reconciliation and rapprochement with the Yugoslav revisionists, taking no account of the fact that they have been unanimously condemned as traitors to Marxism-Leninism and as enemies to peace in the 1960 Moscow Declaration. Everyone who, abiding by the Declaration, wages a determined

struggle against the Titoite clique and opposes the line of rapprochement with them, is considered a "splitter", "dogmatist", "sectarian" and the like by Khrushchev and his supporters. It is thus clear that the "unity" to which the July 14 open letter also refers, is a unity with the Titoite renegades on the basis of the fundamental theses of their revisionist program and not a unity based on the Moscow Declarations. Such so-called "unity" with renegades and agents of imperialism is unacceptable to any true Marxist-Leninist; it is the embodiment and incarnation of split.

FACTS SPEAK AGAINST KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS GROUP

One of the most conclusive indictments that have exposed Khrushchev's group as splitters and traitors to socialism, is their hostile attitude towards the Party of Labour and the People's Republic of Albania.

Just as many former writings do, so also does the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union contain a number of slanderous

charges against the Party of Labour of Albania. But facts refute Khrushchev and his group. They have been given in detail and are well founded, therefore, we do not deem it necessary to go into great length on this matter.

Proceeding from their well-known chauvinist positions whereby all those that oppose their revisionist and treacherous line are considered as "tools of the Chinese", Khrushchev's group reiterate this charge against the Party of Labour of Albania in their open letter. Just as before, they distort in a shameless way the relations between the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, which are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The unity of views, the mutual support and aid between the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, spring from their common purpose, from the firm struggle of principle which they wage in defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, from the fight against modern revisionism and not from dictation or submission of one party to another; but Khrushchev cannot conceive of this, for he has other ideas of relations be-

tween fraternal communist parties, for his relations with the other communist parties are built only on dictation and submission.

Khrushchev and his group are well aware of the fact that the Party of Labour of Albania, as an independent and equal party, has never submitted to anyone and is nobody's tool. It submits only to Marxism-Leninism, is a tool only in the hands of its working class and people who strive to build socialism, who fight for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism over revisionism. Khrushchev himself has had occasion to witness how "dependent" our Party is and how easily it can be prevailed upon to kowtow to others; but what Khrushchev himself failed to attain he now tries to attribute to others with the express purpose of discrediting the Party of Labour of Albania and slandering the Communist Party of China. Vain attempts! Khrushchev will never achieve these ends.

Khrushchev has long been trying, in vain, to persuade people about his accusations against the Party of Labour of Albania, namely, that it "brought about the deterioration of Albanian-Soviet relations", that it has advanced "an opportunist leftist platform on

the basic issues of the present epoch", that it has adopted "a hostile policy against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal parties", or that "the leaders of the Communist Party of China are doing their best to utilize the Albanian leaders as their mouthpiece" and that now "they have launched them directly in open warfare against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and fraternal parties".

But all the communists and progressive people in the world know that the real cause for Soviet-Albanian differences does not at all lie in the trumped-up charge that our Party advanced "an opportunist leftist platform", but in Khrushchev's revisionist line, in his endeavors to force this line on our Party through threats, pressures, blackmail, blockades, etc., contrary to all principles and norms. Everybody knows by now that it was Khrushchev who first aired our divergencies in public before the enemy, who quite arbitrarily assailed the Party of Labour of Albania in public from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress and intervened brutally in its internal affairs, going so far as to

launch calls for counter-revolution to overthrow the leadership of the Party and of the state in Albania, who extended the ideological differences between our parties into the field of state relations, by withdrawing all Soviet specialists from Albania, by expelling all Albanian students from the Soviet Union, by annulling all agreements and contracts for credits and trade relations, by trying to weaken the defensive power of the People's Republic of Albania and by plotting against it and even rupturing diplomatic relations with Albania.

The fact that Khrushchev repeats his slanders against our Party and our country in the open letter, shows, on the one hand, his unrestrained chauvinist resentment against a Marxist-Leninist party and socialist country which dared oppose with firmness his line of betrayal; on the other hand, this is a new attempt to justify, before public opinion, the communist movement and the Soviet people, his inadmissible anti-Marxist and anti-socialist acts towards our Party and country, which are a shameful ineffaceable stain that can be matched only with the most reactionary acts of the imperialist enemies. But no matter to what manoeuvres they re-

sort, Khrushchev and his group cannot escape the great responsibility for these hostile acts which are seriously detrimental to the cause of socialism.

THE REVISIONISTS DREAD THE FIGHT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS

In their open letter Khrushchev's group bitterly attack also the true revolutionary communists in the ranks of the communist and workers' parties of various countries who have taken up the cudgels against the traitorous line of Khrushchev and his followers in defense of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They are accused in the letter as "Trotzkyites", as "anti-party elements", as "renegades" and so on and further as "tools of the Chinese", who are coaxed, organized and directed by them. This is one of the "strongest arguments" of Khrushchev's group to prove that the Chinese comrades are the splitters of unity of the international communist movement.

Just as the bourgeoisie formerly considered the communist movement in every capitalist country as something incited and organized

by Moscow, so today do Khrushchev's group consider the correct opposition to revisionism by the revolutionary communists as something incited and organized by Peking. Here again we find the congruence of views between the bourgeoisie and the modern revisionists! According to Khrushchev, the revisionists are entitled to assail Marxism-Leninism and all those who are loyal to and uphold it, by using against them every kind of method and means, by violating all principles; they are entitled to smash all communist parties and to keep the masses away from revolution, while the revolutionary communists do not enjoy the right to defend Marxism-Leninism and themselves and to oppose the revisionists who are leading their parties into disaster and who are betraying the interests of the working class and the cause of the revolution of all peoples.

But whatever attacks and slanders they may hurl at the internationalist communists, the revisionists will expose themselves, for the bulk of the communists are well acquainted with Khrushchev and his followers and know what they are after. The awkward accusations contained in the open letter bespeak of at least two things. Firstly,

that Khrushchev's group apply the same yardstick to others as to themselves, thinking that only they and their party are independent and have their own views, while all others are tools of someone else; apparently Khrushchev applies the same chauvinistic treatment not only to his opponents but also to his friends and supporters! Secondly, they show the deep concern of Khrushchev's group over the fact that their positions and the positions of their supporters and followers are becoming more and more unstable every day, while the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist forces are becoming continually stronger and stronger. This is also the reason why they attack these forces with such fury.

The base slanders and accusations of the revisionists arouse nothing but disgust. The struggle that the true Marxist-Leninist forces of all countries of the world are waging against modern revisionism is a hard one but it is at the same time a correct, heroic and glorious one that cannot but win the sympathy and enjoy the support of all those to whom the ideals of socialism and communism are dear. In spite of their slanders and attacks, the modern revisionists cannot

conceal the justice and magnitude of this struggle which keeps on growing and terrifies the revisionist renegades, foretelling their inevitable doom.

Thus, the historical facts and day-to-day experiences go to show that Khrushchev's group sow dissension in the socialist camp and the international communist movement, that they are the sworn enemies of Marxist-Leninist unity, that they are opposed to joining with friends, with Marxist-Leninists, with socialist countries and communist parties, that they have now embarked on a "holy alliance" with the enemies of Marxism-Leninism and socialism, of peoples and peace, with the American imperialists, the Indian reactionaries, Tito's clique and the Roman Pontiff.

The unity of which Khrushchev speaks is only high treason, a big plot, which must be condemned and exposed with all force. The struggle for true Marxist-Leninist unity is inseparable from the fight against splitters, against modern revisionists represented by the Khrushchev-Tito group, against their views and acts which have seriously endangered not only the cause of the unity

of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, but the very destiny of socialism and communism in the world.

IV

The whole line of action of Khrushchev's group during recent days shows that they are firmly determined to proceed along the path of betrayal, along the path of splitting the communist movement and the socialist camp and towards getting closer to, collaborating and joining up with the imperialists through new alliances. This is clearly noticed today not only by Marxist-Leninists who have risen in protest against this high treason — the highest betrayal of the working class, the cause of socialism and of peoples in the world so far — but also by the imperialists who try to meet Khrushchev halfway and to facilitate his job. It is precisely due to this that the open letter was hailed and joyfully welcomed by all the imperialists and reactionaries; it is precisely due to this that the latter approve of, incite and give sympathetic reception to every step Khrushchev takes along his path of betrayal.

TOWARDS THE DEGENERATION OF THE SOCIALIST ORDER

Khrushchev's group have given ample proof of their desire and inclination to get closer to and join with the West, with the imperialists and particularly with the American imperialists; both their foreign as well as internal policy pursue a course which is essentially a policy of degeneration and gradually transforming the socialist order in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries into an order of the bourgeois type with Titoite Yugoslavia as a sample. Khrushchev's often repeated sympathetic remarks about "socialist construction" in Yugoslavia, about the Yugoslav "valuable experience", about "the advantages" of the so-called "system of self-administration of workers" in Yugoslavia and so on, are by no means casual — and all these at a time when the Yugoslav economy is propped up with dollars of the American and other imperialists, when kulaks reign supreme in the Yugoslav countryside, while capitalist economic laws like competition, anarchy, free play of prices on the market, are at work in the cities — all pointing to the inevitability

of establishing capitalism in Yugoslavia. There are now many facts that go to prove that Khrushchev and his group have taken and are taking ever greater strides towards following the Yugoslav example in their own country, towards making the socialist order there degenerate into a bourgeois and bureaucratic order, such as the decentralization of the management of industry and building construction, dissolution of the Motor and Tractor Stations, chaos and decline of kolkhozian agriculture, distortion of the socialist principle of material interests in order to set up a class of privileged individuals to support and aid Khrushchev in his revisionist course of action, the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the revolutionary party of the working class under the pretext of transforming them into "a state and party of the whole people", etc. Time was when Khrushchev felt scandalized at the aid Tito received from the American and other imperialists, crying out at the top of his voice and wondering what kind of socialism could be built with American dollars, whereas now he does not only justify this aid politically, but encourages and urges the socialist countries to

follow Tito's example, to enter into agreements and relations with the USA, both in the field of trade as well as in the field of credit and investments, in the field of all-round collaboration with the imperialists.

Steps leading to the degeneration of the economic and social order of socialism are being extensively accompanied by steps towards the ideological degeneration of the party and of the labouring masses. Numerous facts indicate that in the Soviet Union, the door is open to penetration of bourgeois ideology. The frequent visits to the Soviet Union of hundreds and thousands of American "tourists", extensive exchange of artists, personalities of culture, businessmen, ministers, senators, the unrestricted influx into the Soviet Union of decadent Western literature and films, the open encouragement of the Western decadent trends in literature and other branches of art in the Soviet Union, etc. — all these speak for themselves. Khrushchev's group have, on the other hand, set the strictest quarantine against any literature of the sister parties which firmly uphold the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and spread the truth, they have closed the

door to cultural exchanges with the socialist countries which stand on correct grounds, they stopped the jamming formerly directed against the Western broadcasts and turned it towards Radio-Peking, Radio-Tirana, etc. The consequences of this course of conduct are being felt more and more in the life of the Soviet Union and of certain other socialist countries whose leaders are following the example of Khrushchev's group. They are being manifested in the movement to keep the masses away from politics, to contaminate and corrupt some of the youth, to spread the Western way of living and so on.

Under these circumstances, Khrushchev's claim that he is allegedly opposed to peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology, is sheer bluff, is a demagogical manoeuvre. The imperialists are not at all disturbed by this kind of "ideological war" of Khrushchev's group against the bourgeois ideology, they even welcome it with pleasure. And how could bourgeois ideology be combated from revisionist quarters when it is plain that revisionism itself is a manifestation of this ideology? Nor is imperialism disturbed by economic competition with a "socialism"

which is well on the way to degeneration or to the so-called "peaceful evolution" preached by Kennedy. The imperialists are not at all disturbed by the "peaceful path" which the revisionists preach today, for this is in fact renunciation of the revolution!

The American imperialists are making no secret of the goal they intend to attain with the help of the line which Khrushchev's group are pursuing under the pretext of peaceful coexistence. This goal has been clearly set forth in the speeches delivered by Kennedy, Rusk and other personalities of imperialism. Significant is a commentary made on the "Voice of America" radio broadcast some time ago saying: "The Government of the USA wants more trade with Eastern Europe, more cultural exchanges, more common information. . . . America hopes to use all peaceful means at its disposal to persuade the peoples of Eastern Europe that it continues to be interested in their aspirations, in their independence and free institutions. It is obvious this long-term policy of peaceful coexistence prompts us to consider the reality as it actually exists today."

IN QUEST OF NEW ALLIANCES WITH THE IMPERIALISTS, TO THE DETRIMENT OF SOCIALISM, PEOPLES AND PEACE

The line of Khrushchev's group to get closer to and join in with the imperialists is clearly evident also in their attempts to renounce their former political, military and economic agreements with the socialist countries and enter into new political military and economic agreements with the imperialists. The Moscow Treaty on the partial ban on nuclear weapons is the first big step in that direction. Talks are now under way with the imperialist powers to conclude a non-aggression pact between the countries comprising NATO and those of the Warsaw Treaty.

The NATO aggressive alliance is living through very critical moments; it has been gnawed at by deep internal contradictions. The French imperialist bourgeoisie are not willing to submit to the dictate of the Americans in either the military or the economic field, and in order to get rid of the American and English yoke and at the same time not be isolated, the French bourgeoisie have linked up with and are trying to

strengthen the alliance with Bonn, which constitutes a danger to peace in Europe and throughout the world. At this political and economic juncture Khrushchev's group of traitors who ascended to power in the Soviet Union by putschist methods, instead of taking advantage of the favorable situation for socialism and world peace to weaken and break up NATO and all other political, military aggressive groups altogether — this group of renegades come to the aid of the American imperialists who represent the principal enemies of world peace and socialism, and at this critical moment of their lives, propose a pact of non-aggression between NATO and Warsaw Treaty members. This, on the one hand, is an aid to the Americans against the "mutiny" within the ranks of NATO, an aid for the Americans to consolidate and maintain the unity of and their domination over NATO. On the other hand, in order to make the conclusion of this non-aggression pact acceptable especially to the Americans and the British and the revengeful circles of Bonn, Khrushchev's group will have to make further concessions, and the major concession this time will probably be the sale of Berlin and the Ger-

man Democratic Republic to Bonn. Khrushchev is sure to find ways and forms in which to achieve this betrayal.

Such a change of alliances does not improve matters, on the contrary it makes the situation much worse. This much will not satiate the greedy American imperialists and Bonn revengers, they will want to go further. Besides, an arrangement of this kind will not quell the contradictions among the imperialists; on the contrary they will become worse, but Khrushchev's group will plunge the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Treaty too, in this devilish dance of the imperialists. Thus, revisionist Khrushchev is playing with fire and is adding to the risks of a third world war.

The preliminary talks which are under way between Khrushchev's group and the American imperialists on the non-aggression pact between the aggressive NATO bloc and the Warsaw Treaty members are as illegal as they are dangerous. They are illegal and risky because an act of this kind cannot be undertaken without preliminary discussion on this matter by all the states making up the Warsaw Treaty. They are illegal and risky because the socialist countries making

up the Warsaw Treaty will not tolerate giving up their ideals, in order to plunge into the devil's dance of Khrushchev and the imperialists and to give a free hand to the American imperialists and their satellites grouped in aggressive blocs like SEATO, CENTO, the Balkan Pact and newer alliances, to act against the socialist countries not taking part in the Warsaw Treaty, in order to further Khrushchev's gloomy designs. They are illegal and dangerous because there can be no toleration of a pact hindering the socialist countries from coming to the assistance of the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of peoples languishing under colonialist rule, or from defending the peoples who have won their independence from imperialist aggression. They are illegal and dangerous for they would open the way for Khrushchev to strike other bargains with the imperialists against socialism and at the expense of the peoples.

But the Soviet people and communists as well as peoples and communists of the socialist countries will not tolerate Khrushchev or his followers putting into execution their treacherous designs against the in-

terests of the socialist camp and the people of various countries.

Khrushchev likes to pose as a champion of the interests of the socialist camp proclaiming loudly that the weapons which the Soviet Union possesses are capable of securing all the socialist countries and that his group "will not waver" to use these frightful weapons against the aggressor. People look at the deeds and do not heed Khrushchev's empty words. If Khrushchev were really concerned about raising the defensive power of the socialist camp, which is the main guarantee to preserve peace in the world, and were really in favor of safeguarding the achievements of the peoples of the socialist countries, how can his bargain with the imperialists and his acts which weaken the defensive power of the socialist countries be explained? Does not a proof of this lie in his liquidating the Vlora military and naval base in Albania, or in the fact that he not only refuses to give the necessary aid in the field of defense to the People's Republic of China, but, in agreement with the American imperialists, tries to hinder it from possessing modern weapons of war? How can it then be explained that he furnishes

arms to the Yugoslav revisionists, to these agents of imperialism, who nurture aggressive designs against the People's Republic of Albania, or the fact that he armed the Indian reactionaries and incited them to carry out aggressive actions against the People's Republic of China?

Khrushchev's group have not only plunged headlong into the traitorous path of making the socialist order degenerate and getting closer to the imperialists themselves, but they try by all methods and means to draw the other socialist countries with them. That is why they crudely intervene in the internal affairs of these countries, use all kinds of methods of threats and pressure, even organize plots to remove whole groups of Marxist-Leninist leaders, or to replace wavering elements with elements who are determined to proceed unwaveringly along his path, by making use of force, too.

Khrushchev's group find it not too easy to realize their objective on this more and more open road of betrayal. They come across many difficulties and contradictions. They are in deep conflict with fraternal parties and socialist countries which abide by sound Marxist-Leninist principles, with all the rev-

olutionary communists of the world, they are in conflict with the Soviet people and their entire historical experience, as well as with their own friends and allies, who also have their own interests at heart. Nor does everything run smoothly in the relations with the various imperialist groups, who have their own interests, common and individual, and with which Khrushchev's interests are now interwoven. These are the contradictions regarding the distribution of zones of influence, especially with regard to the attempts of American imperialists to achieve world hegemony. All of these compel Khrushchev to manoeuvre — these explain his zigzags and attempts to become co-partner in the imperialist game to "decide the future of the world".

But Khrushchev and his followers expose themselves when they proceed along this path. They will not be able to carry their designs through. The communists, the people of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries, the peoples of the world are awakening, every day they understand better and better along what a dangerous path the revisionists are leading them. The Marxist-Leninist parties and the communists

and revolutionaries throughout the world are up and doing, and have risen as a body to forestall this danger. The fight against modern revisionism, the fight to expose it to the end, to deal it a death blow, is today a struggle of historical significance and a lofty internationalist task of every proletarian revolutionary.

The bourgeoisie, all the reactionary forces and opportunists of every hue have done their utmost over a century to overthrow Marxism-Leninism, to weaken and make short work of the international communist movement, to exterminate socialism, but all these attempts have been frustrated by the insuperable force of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, by the courage, determination and heroism of the communists and the revolutionaries. Marxism-Leninism has always emerged victorious from every storm and battle, taking hold of the minds and the hearts of millions of people on all continents. There is not the least doubt that in the new battle with the modern revisionists of the Tito-Khrushchev group it will again emerge victorious and its unstained banner will wave, as ever, with pride over our globe.